

AMENDMENTS

In the claims

Please cancel Claim 17

Please amend the following:

31 1. A process for purifying a naphthalenic carboxylic acid selected from the group consisting of 2,6-naphthalenedicarboxylic acid and 1,5-naphthalenedicarboxylic acid comprising contacting an impure naphthalenic acid and a purification solvent selected from the group consisting of water or mixtures of acetic acid and water in the presence of hydrogen with a catalyst comprising a Group VIII noble metal selected from the group consisting of palladium, platinum, and ruthenium, and a Group IVB metal selected from the group consisting of silicon, germanium, tin, or lead, at a purification temperature of from about 520 to 575 °F. (twice amended)

18. The process of Claim 1 wherein the Group IVB metal is tin. (amended)

32 19. The process of Claim 1 wherein the Group IVB metal is present at between 0.2 and 0.6 weight percent of the total catalyst weight. (amended)

REMARKS

The Examiner stated that Claims 1-20 of the Applicant's invention were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sikkenga et al (US Patent #5,256,817) in view of Partenheimer et al (U.S. 5,081,290).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's finding. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable